

F698

.58

AN ADDRESS

To the People of Indian Territory on the Question of Independent Statehood for Indian Territory, by the Campaign Committee of the Constitutional Convention, Authorized and Assembled at Muskogee, August 24, 1905.

Your Committee present this address containing, as broadly as possible, the principal points, which are obvious and pertinent to this issue, first from a local, second from a National standpoint.

WHY WE SHOULD HAVE A SEPARATE STATE.

1. All people naturally desire self government, the right to control their own affairs and make laws for their own government free from outside interference. This fundamental right is God given, inalienable, indestructible.

2. The absorption of Indian Territory into Oklahoma would not only offend the feelings of the people of Indian Territory, but also the feelings of the people of Oklahoma, the great body of the people of both Territories being opposed to joint statehood.

3. The people of Oklahoma have established a code of laws of their own, suitable to them, based upon the Nebraska Statutes, providing for all public institutions, laying down ordinances for the government of the people in all lines. These rules are not such as would be agreeable or suitable to the people of Indian Territory in a vast number of particulars.

For illustration,

a. They have the free saloon and do not have prohibition of intoxicating liquors.

b. They have a tax system, which has no maximum rate and which encourages the people to scale their property down from its actual value to a very low value, to the injury of the people themselves. When people are invited to undervalue their property on the tax lists without any authorized standard, it excites rivalry in the name of tax

dodging, which injures the moral tone of a people. To such a tax law the people of Indian Territory are strongly opposed.

c. Oklahoma was largely settled from Kansas, where mixed schools have been established by the people and this sentiment would be unacceptable to the people of Indian Territory, although it is not believed that it would largely prevail even in Oklahoma, but it shows the difference of sentiment between the communities.

d. In Oklahoma the people have had to deal with blanket Indians, who had made little or no advance in civilization and this conception of the Indian in Oklahoma would be most obnoxious to the people of Indian Territory, who recognize in the Indian citizen a friend and a social equal.

e. There are numerous laws upon the Oklahoma statutes, which would be most obnoxious to our people.

4 Oklahoma has all of her public buildings established too far away for convenient or economical use by Indian Territory. For example—The Agricultural and Mechanical College, the Agricultural Experiment Station, the College of Agriculture, the Colored Normal and University, the Territorial Library, the Northwestern Normal School, the Oklahoma Normal School, the University of Oklahoma, etc., etc. Indian Territory would send a constant stream of tax money taken out of the pockets of our people and out of circulation in our towns and this money would be put in circulation in Oklahoma towns to the permanent harm of our commerce. If we had our own institutions this money would circulate in our own midst and constitute no drain upon our finances.

5. Oklahoma has the Capitol fixed and if she adopts a constitution, would make the location permanent and compel every person in Indian Territory who had business there to leave Indian Territory and go into Oklahoma at a greater expense for its transaction. This alone would cost our people many thousands of dollars annually and great loss of time. There is no good reason why Indian Territory should not have its own Capitol and why the people of Indian Territory should not vote upon the question as to where the Capitol should be located. We have many worthy cities, which would like to enter the lists for this honor and our people should have the right by their vote to locate their own capitol. Our people are conservative. They would build a Capitol suitable to their needs and not for the sake of ostentation. **In case of the location of the Capitol in Oklahoma no one can tell what burdens would be put upon our people for an expensive building outside our own Territory.**

6. Indian Territory people have grown accustomed to the statutes of Mansfield's Digest, which with some modifications would be acceptable and agreeable to them. If there should be a complete change of statute and the Oklahoma Statute prevail, all of our citizens would have to learn the new code, to their great annoyance and to their pecuniary loss. Our citizens would be compelled to constantly refer to attorneys, at an unnecessary expense, to learn the new code, which would occasion a further pecuniary loss. It would be an ill wind that would

EGP 2.5 1422

blow no good and it is fortunate that our attorneys, at least, would be benefited by this increase of business.

7. There is no sympathetic relation between Oklahoma and Indian Territory that justifies a union of these communities. Oklahoma is settled from Nebraska, Iowa and Kansas; Indian Territory from Missouri, Arkansas and Texas. Oklahoma's representative men have repeatedly attempted an unfair advantage in the Joint State Bill, as in the Doyle Bill they sought a majority of sixteen votes, and in the McGuire Bill of ten votes in the proposed constitutional convention with the election machinery in the hands of the Oklahoma officials. There is a difference in ideals which it is hard to explain in words, but it is assuredly true and it makes the people of Indian Territory feel strongly disinclined to this union and it makes the people of Oklahoma feel equally opposed to such a merger. In Indian Territory we probably have 75,000 miners in the coal and oil fields. Why should Oklahoma, having no miners, pass laws for the government of our people in these great coal and oil fields, and this illustration applies in numerous other particulars.

8. Indian Territory has a treaty right to separate statehood, because the United States gave its sacred promise to the Indians of the Five Civilized Tribes that the country occupied and owned by them, should never be included in any other State or Territory without their consent. The United States received and still retains valuable considerations in land and other things of value to the government in exchange for this grant and pledge made to the Indians of Indian Territory. These treaty provisions are as follows:—

CHEROKEES.

"Article 5. The United States hereby covenants and agrees that **the lands ceded** to the Cherokee Nation in the foregoing article shall in no future time, without their consent, be included within the territorial limits or jurisdiction of any State or Territory." (Rev. Ind. Treaties, p. 69.)

CREEKS AND SEMINOLES.

"Article 4. The United States do hereby solemnly agree and bind themselves that no State or Territory should ever pass laws for the government of the Creek or Seminole Tribes of Indians, and that **no portion of either of the tracts of country** defined in the first and second articles of this agreement shall ever be embraced or included within or annexed to any Territory of State, nor shall **either or any part of either** ever be erected into a Territory without the free and full consent, or without the legislative authority of the Tribe owning the same." (Rev. Ind. Treaties, p. 111.)

CHOCTAWS AND CHICKASAWS.

"Article 4. The government and people of the United States are hereby obliged to secure to the said Choctaw Nation of red people the jurisdiction and government of all the persons and property that may be within their limits west, so that no Territory or State shall ever have a right to pass laws for the government of the Choctaw Nation of red people and their descendants, and that **no part of the land** granted them shall ever be embraced in any State or Territory." (7th U. S. Stat., P. 334.)

Recently in an official report submitted on March 7, 1904, to Congress, by the President of the United States, upon the public service in the Indian Territory, prepared by Hon. Charles J. Bonaparte, the present Secretary of the Navy, the following striking language occurs. (S. Doc. 189, 58th Con., 2nd Sess., p. 25):—

“Present situation in Indian Territory.”

“To appreciate this situation one must remember the obligations of the government of the so-called Five Civilized Tribes. These tribes consented to give up their habitation in other parts of the United States and remove to the Territory in return for certain solemn and explicit pledges made to them by the United States, embodied in treaties ratified, with all needful constitutional formalities, and further evidenced by numerous official documents of the highest authority. The removal of these Indians to their new homes was desired and effected by our government to serve grave ends of public policy, and their consent to it constituted an ample consideration for the promises made them in return. If these promises are not binding on the United States, then our government and people can be bound by no treaty. If we do not scrupulously respect the rights flowing from these treaties no one can reasonably place confidence in our National honor.”

The Federal Congress will assuredly keep in good faith these pledges of the people and government of the United States.

We deny that there is any disposition on the part of the people or the authorities of the United States to wilfully disregard the honor and plighted faith of the Nation, and we allege, that whenever these treaties are laid before the Congress of the United States by the proper authorities of the people of Indian Territory, they will be respected.

We call attention to the fact that this has not heretofore been done in any adequate manner.

One of the chiefs of the Five Tribes, recently said and spoke the faith that was in him. “I am unable to believe that the government will lie to us on our death-bed.” This figure of speech is offered as an evidence of faith which prevails among the Indian people of Indian Territory and in which their white neighbors may rightfully participate.

9. The government of the United States for seventy-five years has pursued the fixed policy to exclude intoxicants from Indian Territory, not only by treaty pledge, as with the Cherokees. (Rev. Ind. Treaties, p. 96,) etc., but in the more recent agreements, they have reiterated these promises, for example with the Seminole Indians, December 16, 1897, (30 Stat., 568,) as follows:

“The United States agrees to maintain **strict laws in the Seminole Country** against the introduction, sale, barter, or giving away of intoxicants of any kind or quality.”

As late as June 28th, 1898, in “An act for the protection of the people of Indian Territory and for other purposes,” the United States pledges the Indian country against the introduction of intoxicants, and

by express agreement with the Choctaw and Chickasaw (sec. 29) stipulates as follows:—

“That no law or ordinance shall be passed by any town which interferes with the enforcement of, or is in conflict with, the laws of the United States in force in said Indian Territory, and all persons in such towns shall be subject to said laws, and the United States **agrees to maintain strict laws in the Territory** of the Choctaw and Chickasaw Tribes against the introduction, sale, barter and giving away of liquors and intoxicants of any kind or quality. (Public, 162 pp 16.)

On May 1, 1901, the United States contracted with the Creek people (sec. 43) as follows:—

“The United States agrees to maintain strict laws in said Nation against the introduction, sale, barter, or giving away of liquors or intoxicants of any kind whatever.”

The Senate of the United States had their attention called to these treaty provisions and others relating to these matters by the Women's Christian Temperance Union of the United States and by the Anti-Saloon League, through Hon. Edwin C. Dinwiddie, Legislative Superintendent and the Senate of the United States by a vote that was practically unanimous, decided in favor of prohibition for the new state, proposed by the Hamilton Bill, including Indian Territory and Oklahoma as a prohibition state. This action of the Senate persuaded Oklahoma that the two communities were not homogeneous. It would instantly, have destroyed, upon being put into effect about \$20,000,000 of saloon fixtures and breweries and other investments in the brewery and liquor trade of Oklahoma. This illustrates how differently the communities are situated and that they ought not to be forced into an unnatural union.

INDIAN TERRITORY ENTITLED BY POPULATION.

10. Indian Territory in 1900 had 392,000 population, Oklahoma had 398,000. At that time Indian Territory was most unfortunately situated for immigration. No citizen of the United States could buy a town lot or buy a 40 acre tract of land upon which he might erect a home. Oklahoma had had the advantage for many years of giving away homestead tracts of 160 acres to a man from anywhere on earth who was willing to come and locate upon an unimproved quarter section in its confines.

Such an invitation had settled Oklahoma by putting a settler upon each quarter section. Since 1900, therefore, Oklahoma has not had much occasion for immigration beyond that which is natural to a country fairly well settled. Oklahoma probably increased in the last five years 75 per cent. It has probably 700,000, but since 1900, Indian Territory has had a great change of statute relating to the lands and right to settlement in towns and country. Everywhere through Indian Territory titles can now be obtained to town lots and agricultural and mineral lands. The land is no longer held by tribal government, but

is in the hands of individuals with the right to lease and sell under certain limitations. A gas and oil field of enormous extent,, extending from the Kansas line to the Canadian River and from Fort Smith to Henryetta has been actually developed by the drill. The Indian Territory in 1890 had 180,000 population and had gained in 1900, 211,878 people, an increase of 217.6 per cent. If the increase for the last five years were at the same rate, the population of Indian Territory would now exceed 800,000, but everybody knows that with the change of land title in Indian Territory, the rate of immigration has been enormously stimulated and it would be more nearly correct to put the population of Indian Territory at an increase of 200 per cent in the last five years, rather than 108 per cent. A very conservative estimate of the population of Indian Territory would be 1,000,000 people, and in two more years at the same rate of increase we should have not less than 1,400,000 people. These people represent not only the greatest organized body of native American Indians in the United States, but also the best blood and brain of the various states of the Union from Maine to California. Its per cent of native born population is exceeded by very few states in the Union.

The following table will show the proportion of native born whites of foreign parentage and foreign born whites in some of the states of the Union. (Percentage one is native born of foreign born parents; two, foreign born persons. Census 1900.)

I. T. N. Y. Conn. Mass. R. I.

1. Per cent. of people of foreign parentage—2.6 33.2 31 32 32.8
2. Per cent. of people of foreign birth—1.2 26 26.1 29.9 31.2

Assuredly by population Indian Territory is entitled to statehood. It exceeds in population that which a large number of the states had by the census of 1900, to-wit:—

Colorado	540,000	North Dakota	319,000
Connecticut	908,000	Oregon	414,000
Delaware	185,000	Rhode Island	428,000
Florida	528,000	South Dakota	402,000
Idaho	162,000	Utah	277,000
Maine	694,000	Vermont	344,000
Montana	243,000	Washington	518,000
Nevada	42,000	Wyoming	93,000
New Hampshire	412,000	West Virginia	959,000

We have now a population three times as large as any state had at the time of its admission to the Union.

We submit a table showing the population of these Territories in comparison with a number of the States of the Union at the dates of their admission to statehood:—

Arizona, 1900, population,	122,931
New Mexico, 1900, population,	195,310
Oklahoma, 1900, population,	398,331
Montana admitted November 8, 1889; population, 1890,	132,159
North Dakota, admitted November 2, 1889; population, 1890,	182,719
South Dakota, admitted November 2, 1888; population, 1890,	328,803
Utah, admitted, January 4, 1896 population, 1900,	276,749
Vermont, admitted March 4, 1791, population 1790,	85,425
Idaho, admitted July 3, 1890, population 1890,	84,385
Wyoming, admitted July 10, 1890, population 1890,	60,705
Ohio, admitted November 29, 1802, population 1800,	45,365
California, admitted September 9, 1850, population, 1850,	92,597
Indiana, admitted December 11, 1816, population, 1810,	24,520
Illinois, admitted December 3, 1818, population, 1820,	55,211
Washington, admitted November 11, 1889, population, 1890, ..	349,390
Minnesota, admitted May 11, 1859 population, 1890,	172,023
Nebraska, admitted March 1, 1867, population 1870,	122,993
Oregon, admitted February 14, 1859, population, 1860,	52,465
Alabama, admitted December 14, 1819, population, 1820,	127,901
Florida, admitted March 3, 1845, population, 1850,	87,445
Iowa, admitted December 1846, population, 1856,	192,214
Delaware, (one of the original 13 states) population, 1900, ..	184,735

INDIAN TERRITORY ENTITLED BY AREA.

Indian Territory has 31,300 square miles. The average size of Oklahoma and Indian Territory is 34,660 square miles. The average size of the states east of the Mississippi River is 32,884 square miles. Indian Territory is greater in area than any of the following states:—

	Sq. Miles
West Virginia,	24,645
Vermont,	9,125
South Carolina,	30,170
Rhode Island,	1,052
New Jersey,	7,525
New Hampshire,	9,005
Massachusetts,	8,040
Maryland,	9,860
Maine,	29,895
Delaware,	1,960
Connecticut,	4,845

Yet these states are in the Union and no question of area is ever raised against them. The Indian Territory is within a fraction of the size of Indiana, Virginia, Tennessee or Ohio.

INDIAN TERRITORY IS ENTITLED BY ITS RESOURCES.

It is entitled to statehood because of its enormous natural resources. It has vast fields of bituminous coal. It has the largest con-

tious oil and gas fields of any State in the Union. It has millions of acres of magnificent forests, containing pines and hard woods of the best quality. It has granite, marble, lead, zinc, iron, fire clays, splendid brick-making shale and every kind of building stone. It produces splendid corn, wheat, oats, rye, flax, cotton and all the fruits and vegetables known to the temperate zone. It is magnificently watered, with abundant rainfall and with a fine climate.

THE INDIAN TERRITORY IS ENTITLED TO STATE GOVERNMENT FROM MORAL CONSIDERATIONS.

Without an organized state government, it has no mode of providing schools for its children, but must rely upon unorganized individual effort.

It has no means of taking care of insane persons, but such unfortunates must be treated as criminals and sent outside of Indian Territory and delivered over to strangers, far away from those who love them.

It has no way of building roads and bridges or furnishing those convenient ways of transportation, so necessary to the welfare of its great agricultural classes.

It has no way of providing for its distressed and worthy poor.

The jails of the United States are full of unfortunate young people who are charged with crime and whose crime has been due to a lack of instruction. Indian Territory has exceeding 150,000 young people who have no proper school facilities. To leave them to grow up in ignorance is a crime against their youth and against the future welfare of our State which the government of the United States can never palliate or deny.

Indian Territory is entitled to admission, therefore—by population, by area, by resources, by precedent, by the natural right of people to self-government, and by moral considerations of the highest importance.

THE ARGUMENT OF THE OPPOSITION.

Proposition 1. The first argument of the opposition is that if Indian Territory were divided from Oklahoma, its boundary would be eccentric, strange and peculiar, and not to be thought of in a scientific demarkation of state lines. Such an argument comes with peculiar grace from the Chairman of the Committee on Territories of the House of Representatives, who represents Michigan. This plea is obviously absurd and shows the poverty of argument on the part of those who deny the right of Indian Territory to its just participation in the affairs of the Federal government. Its boundaries are almost exactly north and south and east and west. It is bound together by innumerable railroads, with perfect convenience of access to all of its people with each other. The committee which made this argument represented Maine, far more irregular than Indian Territory and Maryland, cut in twain by the Chesapeake Bay, and running in a string from the Atlantic Ocean to the Ohio River and Rhode Island

divided in half by an Ocean Bay. Such arguments are unworthy of the Honorable gentlemen who have advanced it.

Second. Our opponents say that Indian Territory and Oklahoma will make a greater state as one state than as two states. This remarkable argument needs analysis. Do they mean to say that the area would be greater as one state than as two states. Certainly not. Do they mean it will produce more corn; certainly not. The implication is that it will be greater politically, and to this we reply, that in either case the people would have local self-government with no enlarged powers as one or two states locally. They would have the same number of members in Congress as one state or two states, but as one state would lose two members to the United States Senate. It is impossible to calculate the importance to the west and to these communities, of two votes in the Federal Senate. As two states they would have four votes in the Senate, where all great National legislation is determined. In the Senate, the great commercial treaties must be approved by two-thirds vote and four Western votes in the Federal Senate would off-set eight Eastern votes, which might possibly favor a matter injurious to the welfare of the West. The idea of a State being called greater because of greater area but with one-half the political power, is absurd. Men using this argument might as well demand of us, that it should be demonstrated that four is greater than two. In fact, in substance they allege that two is greater than four and invite us to the issue.

Third. Our opponents say that it would be more economical to have one state than two. This we vigorously deny. It is true, that as one state there would be one general staff and that their salaries would probably be substantially less than the salaries of two sets of officers performing the same line of duties, but this item would be comparatively small and could not possibly exceed the sum of \$25,000 per annum. This would be a saving as one state. This saving in one year would amount to 2½ cents each, per annum, for the inhabitants of Indian Territory, estimated at 1,000,000 people. This argument is of no importance. The fact is that this saving of two and a half cents each would be lost over and over again by the cost of the people having to travel twice as far to a state capitol.

The great cost of government is in county government, which would be the same as one state or two states and the education of the people, which would be the same in one state as in two states, and the care of the insane and pauper class, which would be the same in one state or two. This analysis of the cost of government is perfectly obvious and requires no further demonstration. The fact is, that with the extravagant tendencies of Oklahoma and the very conservative sentiment of Indian Territory, it would be more economical to conduct a conservative, economical administration of a smaller state than be joined to Oklahoma which would rush into extravagances for capitol buildings and other public institutions already established, which would be promptly enlarged at the expense of the Indian Territory.

Fourth. Our opponents say that we will get statehood sooner by favoring a joint state with Oklahoma. Such a proposition is but little short of impudence.

They have for years been endeavoring to pass a joint state bill and have failed, because they were in a minority: and now they tell us that we should join a minority which is obviously wrong, as a means of quick action rather than to join a majority which is obviously right and on our side. It is like the obstinate juryman who tells the other eleven members, that if they want to get quick action all they have to do is to withdraw their obstinate and unreasonable vote.

The fact is, the great west and the best men of the Republican party now in Congress stand firmly for the principles of justice to the western territories and have made a successful fight in the face of an argument of the greatest importance, used against them, to-wit:—That the people of the Indian Territory and Oklahoma were unanimous in desiring to make one state. When our friends in Congress have the evidence of an overwhelming vote from Indian Territory, showing that we are unanimous in our desire for home rule and self-government without interference from Oklahoma, then our friends in the majority will have a weapon of invincible power. The great argument in Congress of the joint state advocates, has been the wish of the people. When we show that the people do not wish it, that they are vigorously opposed to it, the minority in Congress against us, will have not a foot to stand on, except, that it is to their sectional interests to deny us our rights and this argument, while of force in the cloak room, dare not present itself upon the floor of the Senate, because the American people will not stand for such a proposition.

Fifth. Our opponents say that the east will never permit us to have our rights and therefore we are very foolish to demand these rights.

This astonishing argument is supposed to come from the East. How any Western man can maintain his self-respect and agree to such a proposition, against the interest of his own community and the interest of the great West, and the interest of the Republic itself, is well nigh inconceivable. If those who oppose the best interest of the Indian Territory and the equitable apportionment of power due to the West were conscious of the meaning of their position they would realize the suicidal nature of such a course. We know that they do not realize the fact that they are betraying the interests of their own section and of the great West and therefore we must acquit them of moral turpitude.

Finally:

To those who attempt to meet the earnest movement of our people by insinuation and abuse, imputing evil motives and insincerity to our people we are content to reply that "scurrility is the refuge of defeated argument."

INDIAN TERRITORY FROM A NATIONAL STANDPOINT.

Independent of local considerations, Indian Territory should be given separate statehood from a National standpoint.

Indian Territory with Oklahoma and Texas embraces 333,600 square miles, as big as Maine, New Hampshire, Vermont, Massachusetts, Connecticut, Rhode Island, New York, New Jersey Pennsylvania Delaware, Maryland, West Virginia, Virginia, Ohio, Indiana and half of Kentucky. This northeastern country has 31 votes in the Federal Senate. The Indian Territory and Oklahoma demand two each and with Texas would therefore have six. This great southwest is not only entitled to six votes in the Senate on area, natural resources, and present population, but with its unprecedented immigration will soon be justly entitled to a far larger proportionate representation which it is never likely to claim. The northeast with thirty-one votes in the Senate cannot say to the great southwest that it is not entitled by area, number, and quality of population and by resources, to six votes in the Federal Senate, as its rightful apportionment of power in Federal affairs. The sectional argument against us will only be made in the cloak rooms. It dare not face the intelligent conscience of the people of the United States. The people of **New England** would not support it. This great question will be determined by its moral aspect and because we are right. We can rest assured that we will triumph in this National contest, if we perform our duty, each one in his individual sphere, doing his proper part as a citizen.

That the West appreciates its own rights in this matter is becoming more and more manifest. The legislature of California has instructed its Senators on this matter and has charged them to support separate statehood. The legislature of Colorado has done the same thing and the legislature of every state west of the Mississippi River will do the same thing, when the people of Indian Territory have agreed on this matter and appeal to these states for their co-operation.

Senator McCumber of Dakota and his associates of the far north-west stand firmly for this proposition, sixteen of the great Republican Senators in the 57th Congress stood out for separate statehood and the defeat of the Hamilton Bill.

A number of Senators who were skillfully committed by the joint-state advocates to the Hamilton Bill before they saw the injury that would be done the West by its passage are now no longer committed for the 58th Congress. Some of the new Republican Senators from the West are known to be vigorously in favor of separate statehood for the Western territories, because of the rights of the West which are involved.

West of the Mississippi River the area is 1,590,000 square miles. East of the Mississippi River is 854,000 square miles, omitting Minnesota and Louisiana in the above estimate, which lie on each side of

the river. The center of population is moving steadily west and will soon cross the Mississippi River. East of the Mississippi River are 27 states with 54 Senators, west of the river are 19 states with 38 Senators, with a possibility of four more states and eight more Senators, giving the great West the possibility of 46 Senators against 54 Senators east. The West, by area, by resources, and by population, is entitled to the eight votes from the four great western territories. The average size of the states east of the Mississippi river is 32,884 square miles, while the average size of these western territories is 76,187 square miles, while the average size of the states east of the Mississippi River is 32,884 square miles. We are not impressed with the argument of states of our own size, and smaller, claiming that "It is not our policy to create any more small states in the West."

We do not desire to question the sincerity or high moral purpose of our opponents in the northeast. We do not feel willing to suspect the purity and disinterestedness of their purpose, but if they persist in this argument against small states of an average size of 76,000 square miles, as against their own diminutive areas, they will assuredly strain and possibly dislocate our charitable faculties.

THE RIGHT TO ADMISSION.

Mr. Beveridge in his report on the statehood bill (Sen. Rep. 2206, 57th Cong. 2d Sess.) lays down what he declares to be the principles that should determine admission.

"First. The interests of the people of the proposed new state." We have made this obvious.

"Second. The interests of the remainder of the Republic." It is to the interest of the Republic that a million of its sons, who are of as great intelligence as any equal body of its children from Maine to California, should receive justice, and be given their rightful apportionment of power in the affairs of the Republic. The policy most harmful to the interests of the Republic, and which is most liable to result in injury to it, is an attack upon one section by another and the denial of obvious and elementary justice to one section by another. Such wrong doing against one section by another leads not only to prejudices and suspicions, but to permanent antipathy which impair the harmony of the Nation and jeopardize its welfare.

Mr. Beveridge in outlining the qualifications of the community necessary to admission, said they were:

"First the number of people asking for admission."

On this basis no man can justly deny our qualification on any rule or precedent whatever. We have over thirty times as many as Mr. Beveridge's own state had when it was admitted.

Second, "The condition of those people as to education, and other elements of citizenship."

We stand at the head of the list of states in the percentage of na-

tive born citizens and our educational and other conditions of citizenship fully entitle us.

Third, "The extent of territory occupied by them." No man can deny our right on this basis.

Fourth, "The extent to which they have developed the resources of their territory." Our right on this basis is fully conceded.

Finally, "The extent and character of all natural resources both developed and undeveloped." On this basis Indian Territory is, confessedly, not surpassed by any state in the Union.

It is conceded by all parties, that Indian Territory and Oklahoma are ready for statehood. The only question is, shall they be one state or two states. Their qualifications are abundant as one state or as two states and the only argument that can be found of any substantial force, for uniting the two territories is the argument that the people of Oklahoma and Indian Territory **WANT** it. This argument is based upon a false premise and we propose to demonstrate by a vote of the people of Indian Territory that it is utterly untrue, and that the people of Indian Territory not only do not wish to be united with Oklahoma, but they are violently opposed to it; that they have treaty rights to the contrary upon which they firmly stand; and that they are earnestly in favor of self government, home rule and immediate independent statehood for their own people. In this great contest for the maintenance of our rights to manage our own affairs with our own means for our own people and in our own towns, and in our own homes, we need, we desire, and we respectfully solicit and demand the co-operation of every patriotic citizen of Indian Territory who is as necessary to the success of this contest as a common soldier is necessary to wage war. We believe that we have the approval of our own people in standing up for our rights and the people must determine by their own personal individual acts whether they wish self government and whether they are worthy of it.

For further Independent Statehood Literature write to

Statehood Campaign Committee,

MUSKOGEE, INDIAN TERRITORY.



Phoenix Printing Co., Muskogee, Ind. Ter

LIBRARY OF CONGRESS



0 007 751 123 4